

Response filed 11/25/2009
Response to Office Action mailed 8/26/2009

Application No. 10/599,498

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed August 26, 2009, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive to that office action. Claims 1-5 and 8-13, 15 are pending in this application. Claims 6-7, 14 have been cancelled. Claims 1 and 15 has been amended. No new matter has been added to amended claims 1 and 15. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 15 can be found on page 7 of the specification as originally filed, among other places. Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned by phone if it is felt that this response does not place the Application in condition for allowance.

Examiner Interview

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the interview on September 22, 2009. During the interview, the Examiner suggested that claim amendments be made to overcome the cited art and to move prosecution forward. Therefore, upon entry of this response, Applicants have amended the independent claims to overcome the cited art.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1, 2, 8, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Addington (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0261092), hereinafter referred to as Addington, in view of Eshun (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0031108), hereinafter referred to as Eshun.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, among other things:

delivering a configuration message from the video device manager to the STB,
the configuration message being based on information from the provisioning
datastore, thereby provisioning the STB without essential involvement of the
conditional access system,

wherein the configuration message is sent in response to a boot-time
request from the STB in which the STB discovers a DNS hostname or IP
address of the video device manager from an initialization process and the

Response filed 11/25/2009
Response to Office Action mailed 8/26/2009

Application No. 10/599,498

video device manager determines the STB location by reverse-resolving the STB IP address into a DNS hostname via DNS lookups.

None of the references of record, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest this feature of amended claim 1. A modified version of this feature of amended claim 1 was a part of previous dependent claim 14 (now cancelled). The Office Action on page 9 alleges that Rakib (US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0181800) taught previous dependent claim 14. In particular, the Office Action alleges:

Referring to claim 14, Addington and Eshun do not disclose a method of claim 1 wherein the configuration message is sent in response to a boot-time request from the STB. In an analogous art, Rakib teaches a method of claim 1 wherein the configuration message is sent in response to a boot-time request from the STB (paragraph 6). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the boot-time configuration taught by Rakib to the method disclosed by Addington and Eshun. The motivation would have been to enable the device to be moved to another location and still function on the network.

Applicants respectfully disagree. Rakib merely describes an HCT (set top box) given three IP addresses at boot time: "a fast IP address for a fixed 8 Mbps connection in each forward application channel; a slow IP address for a network using a fixed 0.714 mbps connection in each forward application channel; and a control IP using a forward QPSK channel with a 1 Mbps capacity." (See paragraph 6 of Rakib). Thus, in order to send a configuration message within Rakib, there is no message exchange between a video device manager and an STB such that "the STB discovers a DNS hostname or IP address of the video device manager from an initialization process and the video device manager determines the STB location by reverse-resolving the STB IP address into a DNS hostname via DNS lookups." as claimed.

None of the cited references (e.g. Addington, Eshun, etc) overcome these deficiencies of Rakib, and for at least these reasons, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 distinguishes over the references of record and is in condition for allowance. Claims 2, 8, 12 and 13 depend from claim 1, and are distinguishable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, and further in view

Response filed 11/25/2009
Response to Office Action mailed 8/26/2009

Application No. 10/599,498

of the various features recited therein.

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Addington and Eshun as applied to claims 1 and 2 above, and further in view of Steenkamp (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0168184), hereinafter referred to as Steenkamp. Claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 1, and are distinguishable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, and further in view of the various features recited therein.

Claims 5 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Addington and Eshun as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Cochran (U.S. Patent No. 7,080,397), hereinafter referred to as Cochran. Claims 5 and 9 depend from claim 1, and are distinguishable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, and further in view of the various features recited therein.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Addington and Eshun as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Jost (U.S. Patent No. 7,251,820). Claim 10 depends from claim 1, and is distinguishable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, and further in view of the various features recited therein.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Addington and Eshun as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Freeman (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0035540), hereinafter referred to as Freeman. Claim 11 depends from claim 1, and is distinguishable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, and further in view of the various features recited therein.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Addington and Eshun as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Rakib (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0181800), hereinafter referred to as Rakib. Claim 14 has been cancelled, thereby rendering this rejection moot.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Addington and Eshun in view of Steenkamp, and further in view of Cochran. Independent claim 15 has similar features to those of independent claim 1 discussed above. Therefore, claim 15 is in condition for allowance for similar reasons given in support of claim 1.

Response filed 11/25/2009
Response to Office Action mailed 8/26/2009

Application No. 10/599,498

All objections and rejections have been addressed. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 25, 2009

By: William J. Allen/
William J. Allen
Registration No. 51,393
10 S. Wacker Dr., Suite 3000
Chicago, IL 60606
Tel: (312) 463-5000
Fax: (312) 463-5001